



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE "MORE ANCIENT DIONYSIA" AT ATHENS— THUCYDIDES II. 15

BY EDWARD CAPPS

It is not my purpose to add to the already bewildering mass of interpretations of this famous chapter in Thucydides, nor to discuss, except incidentally, the topographical problems associated with it, but rather again to draw attention to a single phrase, the correct understanding of which is of importance for the history of the festivals of Dionysus at Athens.¹ This phrase is τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια, used with reference to the Anthesteria. So far as I am aware it has always been taken by those who have discussed the Athenian festivals of Dionysus² to mean simply "the older (or even the oldest)³ Dionysia," and has been so interpreted in the belief that Thucydides had in mind, by way of contrast, a festival (or festivals) generally assumed to be the City Dionysia (or the City Dionysia and one other),⁴ which was established later than the Anthesteria. I hope to show, however, that Thucydides has chosen both the adjective ἀρχαῖος and its com-

¹ A brief abstract of the main argument of this paper was presented at the meeting of the Archaeological Institute in December, 1900, and printed in *Am. Jour. Arch.* V (1901), p. 31.

² Frazer (*Paus.* II, p. 212), incidentally speaks of "the more ancient Dionysia." Miss Harrison, whose book, *Primitive Athens as Described by Thucydides*, came to hand after this article was in type, also translates the words by "the more ancient," but with the meaning of 'the earlier,' see p. 85.

³ E. g., Spanheim in Küster's ed. of Aristoph. (1710), *Notae*, p. 298 ("antiquissima Liberalia"), and many since his time.

⁴ The modern discussion of the Athenian festivals of Dionysus began with Jos. Scaliger *De emend. temp.*, 1583, and is very extensive and confusing; an unusually large part of it consists of repetitions of the collections of previous writers, especially of Böckh "Vom Unterschiede d. att. Len. Anth. u. länd. Dionysien," *Abh. Berl. Akad.* 1817=*Kl. Schr.* V, pp. 65 ff., with rearrangement of his material and a shifting of emphasis. The literature before 1817 is listed by Böckh. Between 1817 and 1872, the date of Gilbert *Festzeit d. att. Dion.*, the most important discussions are Fritzsche's *De Len. Att.* (Rostock, 1837) and Mommsen's *Heortologie* (1864). The question was brought into fresh prominence by Dörpfeld, rev. of Haigh *Att. Theat.* in *Berl. phil. Woch.* 1890, cols. 461 ff., whose views were developed by Pickard *Am. Jour. Arch.* VIII (1893), pp. 56 ff., and by Bodensteiner *Blätt. f. Gymn.-Schulw.* XXXI (1895) pp. 209 ff. The views of these and other scholars will be referred to as occasion arises.

parative with scrupulous regard to the nice distinction which the Greeks felt between *παλαιός* 'old' and *ἀρχαῖος* 'ancient'—a distinction which might be blurred or less significant in the positive or superlative forms, but is necessarily felt and consciously expressed in the comparative.

Thucydides in this chapter advances an argument in which it is highly important for him to choose his words, and especially the adjectives denoting age and antiquity, with the greatest precision. He has just entered upon a digression (chaps. 15, 16) the purpose of which is to justify the statement made at the end of chap. 14 that the people of Attica found it exceptionally painful at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War to be obliged to shut themselves up within the narrow confines of the city walls, accustomed as they had been of yore (*ἀπὸ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου*) to the free life of the country. For although Theseus had centralized the administration of Attica, abolishing the various self-governing communes that had exercised almost independent powers under the early kings, and had made Athens the capital of government, yet most of the original inhabitants and their descendents (*οἱ πλείους τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ τῶν ὕστερον* 16. 1) still continued to live as before on their farms (15. 2). They therefore found it hard to adapt themselves to the crowded life of the city. In the course of these observations Thucydides undertakes to demonstrate that the city before Theseus was not a crowded capital, but a small affair, the limits of which he defines, and he does this by drawing inferences from the relative situation of various foundations to this small *πόλις*. It is of course fundamental to his argument that these foundations should be unquestionably ancient; and accordingly, although doubtless all well-informed Athenians would have recognized instantly the antiquity of the sites the historian mentions, he takes nothing for granted, but repeatedly insists upon the fact of their antiquity. In two instances he advances special proofs of this, once by showing the great age of the festival celebrated at the site mentioned—the subject of this paper—and again by adducing the Enneacrounus, a recent foundation of the tyrants, but before their time (*τὸ πάλαι*) associated with certain rites still observed because of their antiquity (*ἀπὸ τοῦ*

ἀρχαίου). Again, the very term πόλις as currently applied to the acropolis is proof of the former settlement there (διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ταύτη κατοίκησιν.) Finally, having thus shown that the ancient Athenians and their descendants were not city dwellers, the historian depicts their feelings when forced to leave their country homes and the shrines which they regarded, in view of their ancient form of government (ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον πολιτείας), as the very memorials of their race.

As this summary shows, Thucydides uses ἀρχαῖος six times, and παλαιός and πάλαι each once. In all these cases, omitting for the moment the one involved in the present discussion, the distinction which is regularly maintained in Greek between παλαιός and ἀρχαῖος is observed with the finest precision. ἀρχαῖος means 'ancient,' 'antiquus,' 'priscus,' while παλαιός, like 'old,' 'vetus,' implies only priority in time.

We take up now the passage with which we are immediately concerned. Thucydides enumerates in 15.4 four ἱερά which are situated "toward this portion of the ancient πόλις." The fourth is τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διόνυσον. As evidence of its antiquity he adds: *ᾗ τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διόνυσια τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶν*, and again, as independent evidence of the antiquity of this festival in turn, he adds that the Ionian descendants of the Athenians still continue to observe this festival on the same date: *ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων Ἴωνες ἔτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσιν*.

The identity of the festival to which Thucydides refers as τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διόνυσια, held in Anthesterion, has never been a matter of dispute; it was the Anthesteria. But opinions have been widely divided as to the other festival or festivals implied by the comparative. One party, whose chief representatives since Böckh's predecessors have been Gilbert and Dörpfeld, have made the comparative, as implying two and only two objects, the pivotal point of their argument in favor of the view that there were only two festivals of Dionysus at Athens.¹ The comparative

¹ I intentionally eliminate from consideration the so-called 'Rural Dionysia,' which should no more be classed with 'Athenian' festivals than the 'provincial' theaters of England with the London theaters. Its inclusion has only bred additional confusion; and yet Farnell *Class. Rev.* XIV (1900), p. 375 a, seems to be the only writer who has protested against this practice.

ἀρχαιότερα has in truth been their strongest argument,¹ and has never been successfully met; nor, strange to say, has it even been frankly acknowledged by the other side to be a serious obstacle to their own theory of three festivals.² The first-mentioned scholars, therefore, believing that Thucydides knew of only two festivals of Dionysus in Athens, one of which was the Anthesteria, and possessing abundant testimony to the independent existence of the City Dionysia, have sought to identify with the dramatic part of the Anthesteria the third festival, the Lenaea, which is often mentioned by name in documents contemporary with Thucydides.

This theory received its death-blow in 1897, when A. Körte and Wachsmuth,³ independently of each other, deduced from an Eleusinian inscription of the year 329/8 (*CIA.* II 834 b ii. 46) the fact that the Lenaeon festival (here called Epilenean) was distinct from the Anthesteria, since it was celebrated in the preceding month. Körte has no occasion to discuss *ἀρχαιότερα*, but Wachsmuth treats the comparative as if it were of no particular consequence for the interpretation.⁴ This fresh documentary evidence, which supplements and confirms beyond doubt indications that were previously at hand, now compels us to accept the view, stoutly maintained by Böckh and his followers, that at the time of Thucydides three festivals of Dionysus were annually celebrated by the

¹ Gilbert *Festzeit*, p. 95: "die älteren Dionysien;" p. 95: "Man darf aus den Worten τ. δ. Δ. mit vollstem Rechte schliessen, dass Thukyd. nur zwei Dionysosfeste in Athen kennt, von denen das eine die Anthesteria, die andern die städtischen Dionysien im Elaphebolion sind;" pp. 99 ff.: "Wurden zu Zeit . . . drei dem Dionysos geweihte Feste gefeiert, . . . so dürfte man mit Bestimmtheit erwarten, das Thuk. nicht von zwei Dionysien gesprochen hätte, wie er dies in dem compar. *ἀρχαιότερα* thut." Pickard "Dionysus *ἐν Ἀθῆναις*" *Am. Jour. Arch.* VIII (1893), p. 77: "Thucydides . . . knew of but two Dionysia in Athens itself; those *ἐν ἄστει* and the Anthesteria. Of these, using the comparative degree, he states that the latter were the *ἀρχαιότερα*." Bodensteiner "Enneakrunus u. Lenaion" *Blätt. f. Gymn.-Schulw.* XXXI (1895), p. 217: "die älteren Dionysien." Dörpfeld *Berl. phil. Woch.* 1890, col. 462: "Thucydides, welcher im Gegensatz zu den Lexikographen und modernen Gelehrten, auch nur zwei verschiedene Dionysosfeste kennt;" cf. *Griech. Theat.*, p. 7. So also Miss Harrison *Primitive Athens*, p. 85. Farnell *loc. sup. cit.*, p. 374 a, says: "The use of the comparative seems inexplicable, if there were three city-festivals of the God."

² With one exception, von Prott; see below, p. 32.

³ Körte "Zur att. Dionysosfesten" *Rhein. Mus.* LII (1897), pp. 168 ff.; Wachsmuth "Neue Beitr. z. Top. v. Athen," *Abh. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* XVIII (1897), p. 40. Farnell, writing three years later, makes mention neither of the inscription nor of these important articles.

⁴ *Loc. cit.* p. 46, quoted below, p. 31, n. 5.

Athenians—the Lenaea in the month Gamelion, the Anthesteria in Anthesterion, and the City Dionysia in Elaphebolion.

If, however, there were three separate festivals at the time Thucydides wrote, what explanation is to be given of the comparative ἀρχαιότερα? It will be instructive first of all to consider what explanations have been given by those who have maintained the doctrine of three urban festivals.

Böckh was convinced of the antiquity of the Lenaea as well as of the Anthesteria. He dated both before the συνοικισμός of Theseus but did not attempt to decide which of the two was the older. Giving to τὰ ἀρχαιότερα the meaning "die ältere," he believed that Thucydides, in contrasting the Anthesteria with the one festival of comparatively recent date, the City Dionysia, simply disregarded the existence of the Lenaea as of minor importance.¹ He recognized the significance of the comparative with its obvious implication of two and only two festivals; his assumption that the Lenaea were of so little importance that they could be overlooked was, however, scarcely justified by the evidence at his disposal, and he was evidently not inclined to adopt the alternative of accusing the historian of carelessness. But today we possess additional evidence in abundance to prove that the Lenaea was by no means an unimportant festival at any time during the lifetime of Thucydides. The dramatic performances there, which the historian must have witnessed frequently, were only less brilliant than those at the City Dionysia. We are safe in asserting that, if Thucydides employed a phrase in which all the festivals of Dionysus were supposed to be included, but by using the comparative with reference to the Anthesteria inadvertently or intentionally left out of account either the City Dionysia or the Lenaea, he was guilty of a carelessness which his own contemporaries would not have overlooked, and which we should find it difficult indeed to parallel in his writings.

Böckh's followers have generally contented themselves with his demonstration that there were three festivals of Dionysus in the

¹ P. 67 in the *Abhandlungen* (= *Kl. Schr.* V, p. 141): "Thukydides nennt die Anthesterien die älteren Dionysien im Gegensatze gegen die grossen, die dabei jedem zunächst einfallen mussten; die Lenaen und ländlichen übergeht er als minder bedeutend."

city, ignoring the grave objection to his interpretation of the Thucydidean phrase that has been pointed out. Several of them, however, have offered other explanations of the comparative adjective. A. Mommsen¹ admits that if Thucydides had known of three festivals which passed under the general heading of 'Dionysia' he would have been obliged to use the superlative; but he insists that the Lenaea, while always Dionysian (p. 24), were not until after Thucydides' time entitled to the appellation 'Dionysia.'

This explanation is clearly untenable; the Lenaea were fully as much entitled to be called by the generic term 'Dionysia' as the Anthesteria, which in fact are specifically so called in classical times only by Thucydides in ii. 15.² The current designation of the January festival in classical times is τὰ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ, later τὰ Λήναια—both adjectival phrases with which the only noun to be supplied is Διονύσια. When Aristotle *Pol. Ath.* 57. 1 desires to refer to the Lenaea specifically, he quite naturally says Διονύσια τὰ ἐπιλήναια, which is the phrase used in the hide-money inscription *CIA.* II. 741; cf. ἐπιλήναια εἰς Διονύσια in the Eleusinian inscription cited above.³

¹ *Feste der Stadt Athen* (1898), p. 372: "Διονύσια ward das Fest (i. e. the Lenaea) erst später genannt, Thukydides kennt es unter diesem Namen noch nicht; er spricht von den Dionysien des Anth. als den älteren, τὰ ἀρχαῖότερα, wobei er o. Zw. die städtischen als die jüngeren im Auge hat; hätte er noch ein drittes Fest, die Lenäen, unter dem Namen Διονύσια gekannt, so würde er τὰ ἀρχαῖότερα sagen." In strange contradiction to this argument is his comment on the fact that Thucydides speaks of the Anthesteria as 'Dionysia,' although they were no longer commonly so called; see next note.

² Mommsen recognizes this fact, but urges (*loc. cit.*, p. 387) that the Anthesteria, though known in early times as 'the Dionysia,' yet lost the right to the title after the establishment of the City Dionysia. In note 2, p. 387, he says: "Da die Anthesterien Dionysien waren, so konnte es natürlich niemandem gewehrt werden, sie so zu nennen, aber im gewöhnlichen Sprachgebrauch haben sie nicht einfach Dionysien geheissen"—not seeing that, by the same line of reasoning, the Lenaea also, since they too were from the earliest times Dionysian, would have to be included among the other Dionysia in Thucydides. Mommsen forgets, also, that Thucydides was particularly concerned in this passage to use names that were familiar and currently used. No better evidence of the "gewöhnlicher Sprachgebrauch" of his time, which recognized that all three festivals were generically "Dionysia," and that each required a distinctive name to distinguish it from the others, could be found than just this passage. See on this point Farnell's protest against Mommsen's explanation, *Class Rev.* XIV, p. 375.

³ So Körte has shown that we should read in both places; *Rhein. Mus.* LII, p. 169.

A. Müller in his latest writings¹ seems to have accepted Mommsen's view. Haigh² also overlooks the difficulty; in the comparative he sees only the meaning "the older" as contrasted with the younger Dionysia, which he assumes to be the City Dionysia. The Bohemian scholar Groh³ suggests that Thucydides purposely excludes from consideration the one festival not celebrated in the part of the city under discussion; but this is scarcely more credible than Böckh's explanation, even supposing that we knew⁴ that the Anthesteria and the City Dionysia were celebrated in one part of the city, the Lenaea in another. Wachsmuth⁵ and Judeich⁶ are not troubled at all by the comparative, treating it as equivalent to a superlative. Finally the proposal of Nilsson⁷ should be mentioned. It is practically the same as that of Wachsmuth, but by seriously trying to defend it he exposes its fatal weakness. He justly argues that Thucydides must have had in mind *all* the festivals of Dionysus and therefore could not ignore one of them as insignificant, as Böckh assumed. He maintains, however, that the comparative may be used in Greek with reference to several objects, provided that all but one may be set off by themselves as constituting a distinct class, as when Lysias speaks of one of four

¹ "Neuere Arbeiten auf dem Gebiete des griech. Bühnenwesens," *Philologus* Supplbd. VI (1891), p. 82; he expresses the opinion that the Lenaea were called 'Dionysia' relatively late. He abandons (*ibid.*, p. 81) the view of Ribbeck, which he held in *Bühnenalterthümer*, pp. 310 ff., that the Lenaea were established in the reign of Peisistratus and the City Dionysia shortly after the Persian Wars, and that the Lenaea, from the establishment of the City Dionysia down to the time of Aristophanes, were deprived of the dramatic contests.

² *Attic Theatre*, p. 37: ". . . the older Dionysia, or Anthesteria, clearly implying that there was another place for the celebration of the later festival, the City Dionysia."

³ *Listy Filologické* 1898, p. 50.

⁴ See below, pp. 40 ff., for the indications which point to the location of the Lenaeon sanctuary in the same region as the Limnae.

⁵ "Neue Beitr.," *Abh. d. sächs. Gesell.* XVIII (1897), p. 46: "Thukydides ii. 15. 4 nennt die Anthesterien als τὰ ἀρχαῖότερα der Dionysosfeste; das kann einem oder mehreren Dionysosfesten gegenüber gesagt sein. Das andere, oder eines der anderen muss das grosse Hauptfest sein."

⁶ *Topographie von Athen*, p. 265, note, col. 1: "Wenn Thukydides den an den Anthesterien (und Lenaien) gefeierten Dionysos ἐν Λιμναίῳ einem anderen (dem in den grossen Dionysien verehrten) oder mehreren anderen entgegensetzt . . ."

⁷ *Studia de Dionysiis Atticis* (Lund, 1900), pp. 58 ff.

brothers as *πρεσβύτερος*.¹ Thucydides, therefore, means to contrast the one festival which was established before the Ionian migration with the other two established after it; *ἀρχαιότερα* is practically equivalent here to "ante emigrationem," the implication being that the other two were "post emigrationem." Now Nilsson himself believes, and advances the evidence to confirm his belief (following Böckh), that the Lenaea also go back to a time prior to the Ionian migration; but he maintains his position by asserting that Thucydides did not know this fact.² We may safely, I think, dismiss without comment this interpretation of the passage.

The dilemma in which those now find themselves who acknowledge that, by the universal usage of classical writers, the comparative in Greek, when accompanied by the definite article, implies two and only two terms of comparison, and at the same time admit the overwhelming force of the evidence which proves the Lenaea to have been an independent festival, is well illustrated in the words of von Prott,³ at the close of his luminous discussion of the Thucydides passage. The passage is worth quoting in full, not only because von Prott accepted and defended Dörpfeld's general interpretation of the passage with the topographical conclusions based thereon, but chiefly because, among the scores of writers who have believed in three festivals, he is the only one who seems fully to have realized the difficulty.

Aber wie ist *ἀρχαιότερα* zu erklären? Aus diesem Comparativ hat Dörpfeld geschlossen, dass Thukydides nur zwei Feste mit einander vergleiche, die grossen Dionysien und die Anthesterien, dass mithin die Lenaen kein selbständiges drittes Fest sein. Man müsste ihm darin unbedingt folgen, wenn nicht ausser der von mir versuchten Rekonstruktion

¹ xiii. 67; cf. also x. 5. The Froberger-Gebauer edition reads the superlative, as does Hug in Xen. *Cyroped.* 5. 1. 6 and Wilamowitz in Theocr. xv. 139, with MS support. Most of the examples given in Kühner-Gerth, § 349 b. 3, are from Homer. Except in Homer the usage is to be considered very doubtful.

² "dixerit autem recte quispiam me oblitum esse Iones quoque Lenaea egisse. non oblitus sum, sed Thucydidem id non cognovisse credo," p. 54.

³ "Enneakrunos, Lenaion und Dionysion *ἐν Αἰγυπτῷ*," *Ath. Mitth.* XXIII (1898) 204 ff. Wachsmuth, in his valuable article "Athenai" in Pauly-Wissowa Suppl. I (1903), cols. 213 ff., does not repair this weak point in his argument (see above, p. 31, n. 5). He does not even mention the difficulty, though he does not repeat his previous interpretation.

eine ganze Reihe anderer Gründe die Lenaien als selbständiges Fest im Gamelion neben den Anthesterien erwiesen. Aber einen Ausweg sehe ich allerdings nicht. Völlig sicher ist, dass Thukydides als Gegensatz zu dem Dionysos ἐν λύμναις den Eleuthereus denkt. Auch werden ganz mit Recht die vom Archon verwalteten grossen Dionysien im Gegensatz zu den Dionysien der Königszeit gestellt. Aber nicht nur die Anthesterien, auch die Lenaien werden vom Könige verwaltet. Trotzdem wird der Comparativ gebraucht, als ob nur zwei Feste vorhanden wären, die mit einander verglichen werden könnten. Und sicherlich hat Thukydides nicht den Superlativ ἀρχαιότατα gebraucht, denn wie hätte er behaupten und entscheiden können, die Anthesterien sein auch älter als die Lenaien? Der Comparativ würde psychologisch vielleicht erklärbar sein, da ja von zwei Göttern und zwei Heiligtümern die Rede ist, wenn nur nicht die ganze bestimmte Angabe τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνι folgte. So muss man denn auch hier einen Mangel von Präzision im Ausdrucke annehmen, wenn man nicht die Frage wirklich für unentschieden halten will. Denn das einzige Mittel, welches die Schwierigkeit beseitigen würde, die Conjekture ϕ τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ <Γαμηλιῶνι καὶ> Ἀνθεστηριῶνι wage ich nicht vorzuschlagen, wenngleich es eigentlich auffällt, weshalb nicht auch die alten und allen Jonieren gemeinsamen Lenaien zum Beweise herangezogen sind (pp. 229 f.).

The solution of which von Prott despaired and which his predecessors sought to find in the carelessness or the ignorance of the historian, or in some artificial interpretation of the Greek, may be found, I think, by observing the precise meaning of the word which Thucydides employs. Here, as elsewhere, the comparative implies two objects only, *but both objects are ἀρχαῖα*.¹ To interpret ἀρχαιότερα as if it meant exactly the same thing as παλαιότερα is a grave error. παλαιός is our 'old' in the full meaning of the word; its formal opposite is νέος 'young'.² The

¹ Is the fact that German has no convenient word for ἀρχαῖος (*uralt* is nearest and has been sporadically resorted to, but it lacks a comparative) partly responsible for this? *Alt* has to do double duty — for παλαιός, of which it is the formal equivalent, and for ἀρχαῖος, of which it is only sometimes practically the equivalent; and *alttere* is forced to represent both παλαιότερος and ἀρχαιότερος. A German colleague illustrates this by the catch-question: "Was ist die Farbe des Haares der alten Deutschen?" One usually suspects a recondite question and answers with Tacitus "blond;" but the real answer is "weis." The French translation "les plus anciennes Dionysies" (Girard in Daremberg and Saglio) is equally misleading. But the English offers no such excuse; we seem to have interpreted the Greek after the Germans.

² The distinctions between παλαιός and ἀρχαῖος laid down by Schmidt *Synonymik d. griech. Spr.* II, pp. 79 ff., seem to me entirely sound. He says nothing, however, concerning the comparatives of the two words, though the difference between them is

adjective itself does not denote the possession of a definite quality of 'age' but of only such a degree of age as to suffice to render its possessor no longer νέος (cf. *πάλαι*). And this degree of age naturally varies widely according to the thing qualified, the circumstances, the desire of the speaker to emphasize or to exaggerate the lapse of time involved, etc. A drama at Athens, for example, was *παλαιόν* the day after it was first exhibited, while a building, a festival, or wine could not acquire age so quickly. *ἀρχαῖος*, on the other hand, means 'ancient,' and denotes the possession either of absolute age, or at least of age that goes back to the beginning (ἐξ ἀρχῆς); its formal opposite is *καινός*, 'new,' 'recent,' 'fresh.' A drama at Athens, to continue the same illustration, was called *καινόν* when still unexhibited, *παλαιόν* after exhibition, but *ἀρχαῖον* could be used of it only after a very considerable lapse of time. The adjective νέον would scarcely be applied to it at all, but if it were, it would mean something like 'modern,' without implying that it had never been exhibited.¹ The pair *ἀρχαῖος*—*καινός* has a certain similarity with the pair *παλαιός*—*νέος*, in that, to a certain extent, they too are relative terms, and at times the two pairs seem to be almost interchangeable (though

most marked in the comparative. Döderlein *Lat. Synonymik* IV, p. 89, draws an entirely wrong distinction, as Schmidt shows. On νέος and καινός see Schmidt, pp. 96, 98, 113, 115.—If these distinctions had been carefully followed a good deal of confusion in the discussion of the Athene-temples on the acropolis would have been avoided. Michaelis *Jahrb. d. Inst.* XVI (1902), p. 22, rightly protests against the common error of interpreting ἀρχαῖος as = παλαιός, but he himself, wrongly, as I think, gives to παλαιός an absolute meaning ("ein Begriff des langen Bestandes, des Alters"), and on p. 11 he uses καινός as a relative term, as if = νέος or νεώτερος. When Xenophon refers to the burning of ὁ παλαιός νέος he must refer to ὁ ἀρχαῖος νέος; the phrase can not mean "the temple which is ancient, indeed, but less ancient than the one called ὁ ἀρχαῖος."

¹ Cf. the formal phrase καινοῖς τραγωδοῖς in honorific decrees (ποιηταὶ καινῶν δραμάτων, Dittenberger *Sylloge*², No. 699), and παλαιᾶ (τραγωδίᾳ) or παλαιὸν δράμα in didascalic inscriptions (*CIA.* II. 973 and 971, frag. g, Wilhelm *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen*, p. 28). An excellent illustration is found in the use of ἀρχαία, παλαιά, and νέα for the periods of Attic Comedy. Aristotle speaks of only παλαιά and νέα, the latter that of his own time, παλαιά of that of the past, i. e., the fifth century. But to later writers the comedy of the fifth century became ἡ ἀρχαία, that of Aristotle's time being called for convenience and to avoid confusion μέση, that of their own time νέα. To scholars of the post-classical period ἡ παλαιὰ κωμῶδια included both the μέση and the ἀρχαία.

a real distinction can generally be made out¹); but ἀρχαῖος and καινός are appreciably less relative and more absolute than the other pair.² Not every thing that is παλαιόν is at the same time ἀρχαῖον, nor that which is νέον necessarily at the same time καινόν, though the ἀρχαῖον will usually be παλαιόν also, and the καινόν also νέον. The former pair is distinguished from the latter by the almost always distinctly felt if not always clearly defined qualities ἀρχαιότης and καινότης respectively.

The superlatives ἀρχαιότατος and παλαιότατος are to be distinguished from each other precisely as are their positives; but the very fact that in them the similar attributes ἀρχαιότης and παλαιότης are raised to the highest degree causes them so to approach each other in meaning as to appear, at first glance, almost interchangeable. But the reason for the writer's choice is generally not to be mistaken. When Plato (*Rep.* ix. 574 c) speaks of the father as being to the son τῶν φίλων ὁ ἀρχαιότατος, he desires to bring out with especial emphasis the son's obligation to one who has been from his birth (ἐξ ἀρχῆς) φίλος (cf. *Soph. O. T.* 385: Κρέων ὁ πιστός, οὐξ ἀρχῆς φίλος), and when Thucydides (vi. 2), speaking of the 'original' inhabitants of Sicily (ὥκισθη ἤδη τὸ ἀρχαῖον), says that the Cyclopes παλαιότατοι λέγονται οἰκῆσαι, he only means that they were 'first-settlers;'

¹ E. g. *Soph. Trach.* 555: παλαιὸν δῶρον ἀρχαῖον θηρός, "a gift made long ago by an ancient monster." The collocation ἀρχαῖος καὶ παλαιός is common; cf. *Plut.* ii. 115 c (of institutions) "ancient and of long standing," *Dem.* xxii. 597. 14 (of the achievements of the forefathers), "out of date and long since past." ἀρχαῖος is often substituted for παλαιός; the effect is recognized by Demetrius (*Walz Rhet. Gr.* IX, p. 79. 11): τὸ 'ἀρχαῖοι' ἀντὶ τοῦ 'παλαιοὶ' ἐντιμώτερον. A more heinous crime is implied in the charge (*Plat. Euthyphro* 3 b) οὐ νομίζει τοὺς ἀρχαίους θεοὺς (= τοὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς) than in οὐ νομίζει τὰ παλαιὰ δαιμόνια (*Apol.* 27 c). παλαιός can be made to do duty for ἀρχαῖος either by being strengthened, as in *Plat. Crat.* 411 b οἱ πάντες παλαιοὶ = οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, or by force of the context; and so with πάλαι and its compounds. Cf. the first line of *Apolonius Argon.* παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν | μνήσομαι, where the scholiast rather awkwardly attempts to draw the distinction, and has not always been understood: διαφέρει τὸ 'παλαιόν' τοῦ 'ἀρχαῖον'· τὸ μὲν γὰρ παλαιὸν καὶ (i. e., may be) ἀρχαῖον, τὸ δὲ ἀρχαῖον οὐκ ἔστι (i. e., not always) παλαιόν, τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον ἀναφέρει εἰς τὸ ἀρχῇ ἐνέχεσθαι. The last point is that a thing that is 'original' is not always 'old.'

² Typical is Nicostratus in *Kock CAF.* II, p. 228 πάλιν χρόνῳ τάρχαῖα καινὰ γίνονται i. e., not relatively 'less old' but absolutely 'new,' 'made-over.' ἡ παλαιὰ Διαθήκη, 'the Old Testament,' may be contrasted with ἡ νέα Δ., the 'Young' (sometimes used), but commonly with ἡ καινὴ Δ., i. e., 'New,' that which has entirely displaced the Old.

παλαιότατοι is the first sub-head under the general heading *τὸ ἀρχαῖον*, and is followed by *μετ' αὐτούς*, etc. One point, however, here calls for especial remark—a point sufficiently obvious in itself, but pertinent to the discussion of the comparative which is to follow. The superlative of these adjectives, as of adjectives in general which denote the possession of a positive quality, while it singles out an object as possessing that quality in a higher degree than all other objects drawn into the comparison, yet does so without implying that these other objects possess this quality or attribute in any degree at all. Callias was the richest of the Athenians; but not all the Athenians were rich. Isocrates *Antid.* 82 says that men praise *τῶν μὲν νόμων τοὺς ἀρχαιοτάτους*, *τῶν δὲ λόγων τοὺς καινοτάτους*; but he does not mean to imply, of course, that there are no *νόμοι* which are *καινοί*, and no *λόγοι* which are *ἀρχαῖοι*.¹

In the comparative degree, however, a real and important distinction may be observed, though it is, I think, commonly disregarded, probably because the positives and superlatives of the two pairs, *ἀρχαῖος*—*παλαιός* and *καινός*—*νέος*, are often (but by no means always) represented by the same adjectives, 'old' and 'oldest' 'new' and 'newest,' respectively, without a serious distortion of the real meaning. The distinction is based upon the fact above stated, that while *παλαιός*, like 'vetus' and 'old,' is a purely relative term, *ἀρχαῖος*, like 'antiquus,' 'priscus,' and 'ancient,' definitely attributes a quality that is relative only in the sense in which, e. g., 'rich' and 'beautiful' are relative. In comparing two objects, one of which is *παλαιόν*, the other *νέον*, the former would be called *παλαιότερον*.² But even if the older object is not simply old relatively to the other, but is in an absolute sense ancient, their relative age will still be expressed, as before, by the comparative *παλαιότερον*, if the words

¹ The above discussion of *ἀρχαῖος*, *παλαιός*, *καινός*, *νέος* and their superlatives is necessarily condensed, and intentionally ignores derived meanings that have lost the temporal signification.

² Aesch. *Eum.* 721: *ἐν τε τοῖς νέοις καὶ παλαιτέροις θεοῖς*. Thuc. i. 1: *τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν* (the Peloponnesian War) *καὶ τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα* has been wrongly suspected; *πρὸ* means "just preceding," and the rest does not literally mean "still more ancient;" cf. Plato *Euthyd.* 286c: *οἱ ἀμφὶ Πρωταγόραν . . . καὶ οἱ ἔτι παλαιότεροι*.

are used strictly.¹ ἀρχαιότερον, on the other hand, presupposes some degree of ἀρχαιότης even in the younger of the two objects, so that we infer that the latter is 'less ancient' rather than simply 'younger.' In other words, παλαιότερον, like νεώτερον, implies only a difference in age, however slight, between objects which themselves may be (1) both ἀρχαῖα, or (2) both καινά, or (3) one ἀρχαῖον and the other καινόν. The comparatives παλαιότερον and νεώτερον, therefore, give us no information whatever on these subordinate points; and when a writer uses them he is concerned in telling us only which is *prior in time* to the other. But not so with ἀρχαιότερον and καινότερον; they purposely group the two objects together as belonging to the same class of things, *both ἀρχαῖα* or *both καινά*, and distinguish them on the basis of their relative priority *within those classes*.² Hence, when a thing is spoken of as ἀρχαιότερον than another, we are definitely informed that the latter, too, is ἀρχαῖον. The same is true also of 'antiquior' (which does duty as the comparative of both *antiquus* and *priscus*) and our 'more ancient,' as opposed to 'vetustior' and 'older.'

That these distinctions are not imaginary, but real and vital, could be shown by many other examples; but a few will here suffice. Aristotle uses παλαιότερος in a definition of 'priority' in a manner which is quite explicit; in *Categ.* 12. 14 a. 29 he says: πρότερον ἑτέρου ἕτερον λέγεται τετραχῶς, πρῶτον μὲν καὶ κυριώτατα κατὰ χρόνον . . . , τῷ γὰρ τὸν χρόνον πλείω εἶναι, καὶ πρεσβύτερον καὶ παλαιότερον λέγεται. The definition is illustrated by his own words *Hist. anim.* 4.11 538 b. 1, where he infers that female fish live longer than the males ἐκ τοῦ παλαιότερα ἀλίσκεσθαι τὰ θήλεα τῶν ἀρρένων. Cf. frag. trag. adesp. 47 Nauck: τοὺς καινοὺς ('newly found') φίλους τιμᾶν, ἀτιμάζειν δὲ τοὺς παλαιότερους. Contrast this manner of indicating mere priority with the use of ἀρχαιότερος. In Aristoph. *Av.* 469 Peithetaerus declares to the birds that they are ἀρχαιότεροι προτεροί τε Κρόνου καὶ Τιτάνων. Socrates says in Plato *Symp.* 195 b that Eros is the youngest of the gods, and not,

¹ Plat. *Protag.* 341 a: κινδυνεύει ἡ Προδικὸν σοφία θεία τις εἶναι πάλαι, ἥτοι ἀπὸ Σιμωνίδου ἀρξαμένη, ἥ καὶ ἔτι παλαιότερα.

² For this reason ἀρχαιότερος and καινότερος are far less frequently employed in comparisons than παλαιότερος and νεώτερος. For καινότερος cf. Dem. iv. 10: λέγεται τι καινόν; γένοιτ' ἂν τι καινότερον ἢ Μακεδῶν ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναίους καταπολεμῶν;

as Phaedrus had claimed, Κρόνου καὶ Ἰαπέτου ἀρχαιότερος. Again *Crat.* 425 *e* the question is asked: "Shall we say that we got the names of objects from barbarians, εἰσὶ δὲ ἡμῶν ἀρχαιότεροι βάρβαροι;" Compare these Latin examples: Cic. *Brut.* 69: *ut nullius scriptum exstet . . . quod sit antiquius*; Ov. *Trist.* 3. 9. 5: *nomen . . . antiquius urbe*; Sen. *Dial.* 8. 5. 5: *aliquid ipso mundo . . . antiquius*; Plin. *Nat. hist.* 5.69: *antiquior terrarum inundatione*. Illustrations from both languages could be multiplied.¹ Although I have made no attempt at an exhaustive list of the occurrences of ἀρχαιότερος, yet I believe that it is perfectly safe to make the following generalization: Wherever the comparative of ἀρχαῖος in the temporal meaning² is found, used not absolutely ('rather ancient') but in a comparison of two objects, it means 'more ancient,' not simply 'older,' and the other member of the comparison is felt to be, not simply 'newer' or 'younger,' but 'less ancient,' and both of the two objects are implicitly classed as ἀρχαῖα.

To return at length to our passage in Thucydides, when the historian, in an argument based upon the antiquity of certain foundations, speaks of the sanctuary of Dionysus in the Marshes as the place where are celebrated in Anthesterion "the more ancient Dionysia," he has in mind (1) two festivals and only two, but (2) these two festivals are both ancient, the one not celebrated in Anthesterion, however, being less ancient than the other.³ The

¹ In schol. ad Aristoph. *Av.* 1403 the opinions of several ἀρχαῖοι are given, of whom Hellanicus and Dicaearchus are properly designated as οἱ ἀρχαιότεροι as contrasted with Antipatrus and Euphronius. The distinction is also maintained by Photius in Hercher's *Erot. Graec.* I, p. 238, ἀρχαιοτέρου τινὸς Ἀντιφάνους, with reference to another Antiphanes, also ἀρχαῖος; on which see Knaack *Rhein. Mus.* LXI (1906), p. 136. Cf. also the proverb quoted by Suidas, ἀρχαιότερα τῆς διφθέρας λέγεις· ἐπὶ τῶν σαθρὰ καὶ παλαιὰ λεγόντων. ἡ γὰρ διφθέρα παμπάλαιος κτλ.

² This restriction is intended to exclude the meaning 'old-fashioned,' 'simplex,' e. g., Plat. *Euthyd.* 295 *c*: ἀρχαιοτέρος εἰ τοῦ δέοντος. In Aristot. *De cael.* iv. 2. 308 *b*. 31: ἀλλὰ καίπερ ὄντες ἀρχαιότεροι τῆς νῦν ἡλικίας, καινότερος ἐνόησαν περὶ τῶν νῦν λεχθέντων, though ἀρχαιότεροι is accounted for by the implication 'simpliciores,' yet the rule is illustrated in καινότερος; for ἡ νῦν ἡλικία καινῶς νοεῖ is distinctly implied.

³ Von Prott (above, p. 33) asks: "How could Thucydides have asserted and determined that the Anthesteria were older than the Lenaea?" It would certainly be impossible for us to determine the fact, except for Thucydides; but we may readily imagine that there were observances connected with the Anthesteria (e. g., at the Χόες,

Anthesteria, he tells us, go back to a time prior to the Ionian emigration. The other ancient festival, whose name he does not mention, must be the Lenaea and not the City Dionysia, for many indications point to the antiquity of the former and to the comparatively recent establishment of the latter. Among these indications three of the most important may be summarized here: (1) The festival-name is associated with the ancient month Lenaeon (corresponding to the Attic Gamelion of historical times), which may have once been the name of the Attic month, for it is found in historical times in Ionian settlements, which continued to celebrate Dionysus Lenaeus in that month. At any rate, the month-name is ancient, and the festival which furnished the month-name must also be ancient, in fact prior to the Ionian emigration. (2) The Lenaeon Dionysus is an older god in Athens than the Dionysus worshiped at the City Dionysia, whose introduction from Eleutherae, commemorated each year, was still a fresh memory in the traditions of the people. (3) The Lenaea, like the Anthesteria, were in charge of the King, not of the Archon, the latter having the direction of the City Dionysia. This fact is a positive indication of antiquity.¹ As between the Lenaea and the City Dionysia, therefore, there can be no doubt that Thucydides thought of the Lenaea as ancient along with the Anthesteria. He did not say τὰ ἀρχαιότατα, which would have included all three festivals (though it would have been perfectly correct), because he was concerned at the time only with things that were ἀρχαία; wishing to exclude from consideration the festival which, as all knew, was relatively recent, he most properly chose the comparative.

Since the Lenaeon festival also was in existence before the time of Theseus, and therefore the sanctuary ἐπὶ Ἀθναίῳ from which the festival took its name, why is it that Thucydides does not mention this sanctuary among the other ἱερά whose situation and antiquity support his contention? Is it because it was not situated "toward this part of the city," and was therefore not available as an indication of the extent of the ancient city? Or

supposed to date from Orestes) which convinced him of their greater antiquity. And he may have judged partly by the ἱερόν, precisely as the writer of the oration *In Neaeram* judged that the sanctuary ἐν Αἰμναίς was older than any of the others.

¹ Aristot. *Pol. Ath.* 57.1: ὡς δ' ἔπος εἰπεῖν καὶ τὰς πατρίους θυσίας διοικεῖ οὗτος πάσας.

is it because the ancient sanctuary no longer existed, as some have supposed? Without discussing in detail the opinions of various scholars¹—opinions which give apparently every possible combination of sanctuary, festival, and site—we may profitably examine Thucydides again to see if some new information on the situation of the Lenaeum may be extracted from him, in view of the new facts (that the Lenaea are implicitly referred to by him, and as ancient) derived in the preceding part of this study.

In the first place, Thucydides does not proceed to mention by name *all* the ancient sites in the region defined by him. He mentions four by name and groups the rest together in the sentence *ἴδονται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἱερὰ ταύτῃ ἀρχαῖα*. In the second place, we cannot accept the suggestion² that the Lenaeum had long since been abandoned and the ceremonies of Dionysus Lenaeus transferred to the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus south of the acropolis. There seems to be no evidence in favor of this view, and, as von Prott³ pointed out, even if the dramatic contests at the Lenaeum were now held in the theater, this would not affect the continuance of the ceremonies of the festival at the original site. Lacking evidence to the contrary, we must treat the Lenaeum as an independent sanctuary. The question then is simply this: Was it situated without or within the region from which Thucydides selects his ancient foundations? If it was within, then it is to be included among the *ἄλλα ἱερὰ ἀρχαῖα* not specifically named.

It should be observed that Thucydides advances the proposition, which he intends shall bear the heaviest burden of proof, that “*all* the ancient sanctuaries that are not on the acropolis itself (*τὰ δὲ ἔξω*), are grouped in this part of the city.” If he had meant that some were here, some elsewhere, the principal part of his demonstration would have been weak in the extreme. He might have said that most of them were in this region, but he does not. But we need not depend upon this general consideration

¹For a fairly complete résumé of the discussion of the topographical problems involved see Judeich *Topographie*, p. 263, note 10.

²Made by Körte *Rhein. Mus.* LII (1897), p. 170.

³*Ath. Mitth.* XXIII (1898), p. 225, note 3.

of what kind of evidence he ought to have adduced; he himself tells us as explicitly as he can that he makes no exceptions to the rule. His first *τεκμήριον* is: "On the acropolis itself are the sanctuaries (*τὰ ἱερά*) of the other gods also," i. e., as Verrall¹ has shown, not of Athene alone. He then adds as his second item of evidence: "The sanctuaries outside (the acropolis) are situated towards this part of the city rather (than elsewhere)," *τὰ δὲ ἔξω πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἵδρυται*.² That he is speaking exclusively of ancient sanctuaries might be taken for granted; but he removes all doubt by saying in the next sentence: *καὶ ἄλλα ἱερά . . . ἀρχαῖα*. In other words, he asserts that all the ancient sanctuaries that are not on the acropolis itself are in this general region. It is a sweeping assertion, and if true conclusively proves the point. If Thucydides had intended to make allowance for the Lenaeum or for other ancient shrines situated in a different part of the city, he should, instead of *τὰ δὲ ἔξω*, have said *τῶν δὲ ἔξω (ἱερῶν) πολλά* or *τὰ πλείστα*, or something of the kind. We are therefore safe in concluding that the Lenaeum was situated in the same region of the city in which was the sanctuary *ἐν Λίμναις*, and that Thucydides intended that it should be included among the *ἄλλα ἱερά ἀρχαῖα*, which were not, perhaps, conspicuous enough to deserve individual mention.

If this conclusion is correct, it simplifies greatly, though it does not solve, the topographical problem. The temple *ἐν Λίμναις* cannot be placed in the valley between the Areopagus and the Pnyx and the sanctuary *ἐπὶ Αθηναίῳ* in the theater precinct or near the ancient Agora. The two belong to the same region.³ If we assign the Limnae to the theater precinct, the Lenaeum goes with it, and we have in consequence an extraordinary grouping

¹ *Class. Rev.* XIV (1900), p. 285 b. So in Krüger's edition the note "*καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν, als der Athene*." Verrall demonstrates clearly that there is no lacuna here. I have adopted his translation of this and the following sentence.

² The sentence is frequently interpreted as if it could mean "the sanctuaries are mainly situated" (so Farnell *Class. Rev.* XIV (1900), p. 370), and this in turn as equivalent to "most of the sanctuaries are situated." But *μᾶλλον* must qualify the *πρὸς*-clause just as *μάλιστα* above does, in the sentence *πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον*, i. e. "to the south, roughly speaking;" cf. von Prott *loc. cit.*, p. 231.

³ Confirming the evidence which we already had on this point, discussed both topographically and from the point of view of ritual by von Prott *Ath. Mitth.* XXIII (1898), pp. 220 ff., 227 f.

of three *ἱερά* in the *τέμενος* south of the theater, Dionysus Lenaeus first (and before the reign of Theseus) having been admitted to the hospitality of Dionysus Limnaeus, and later on Dionysus Eleuthereus also. The grouping of Athene sanctuaries on the acropolis may be thought to be a close parallel; but in this case we have knowledge of only two temples in the theater precinct. And Pausanias saw only two there. Again, the small temple which he saw there and described as *ἀρχαιότατον* would certainly not have been considered by Thucydides as older than the reign of Theseus; we are assured that it is a sixth century structure.¹ These reasons, added to the intrinsic probability of the interpretation of *πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως* in the meaning which Dörpfeld gives to it, and to the discovery by him of a large *Διονύσιον* in the region where the combined testimony of Thucydides and Pausanias would lead us to expect to find the *ἱερὸν ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου*, seem to me to be practically conclusive against placing the Lenaeum and the Limnae sanctuary south of the acropolis. The designation of the temple of Eleuthereus as *ἀρχαιότατον* by Pausanias is to be explained with Wilamowitz as due to the influence of the Thucydides passage, by which the periegete was misled.² And finally, as von Prott (p. 218) has so clearly shown, the peculiar relation of the ancient temple of Dionysus which Dörpfeld has found to the Dionysium in which the *ληνός* is actually preserved (and of course it was not preserved for centuries in the midst of the city for practical purposes), explains admirably why Lenaeum and the Limnae are practically identified in ancient notices, and how the Limnae temple could be kept closed the year round except on the twelfth of Anthesterion without interfering with the use of the Lenaeum at the time of the festival in Gamelion. If the Lenaeum was an adjunct of the sanctuary *ἐν Λίμναις* we may also better understand why Thucydides does not consider it important to mention by name the "less ancient" sanctuary as well as the "more ancient."

¹ By Dörpfeld *Gr. Theat.*, p. 15: "spätestens aus dem vi. Jahrhundert." In material and structure it closely resembles the Hecatompædon on the acropolis.

² *Hermes* XXI (1886), p. 621: "Da hat die Thukydidesstelle ihm, wie öfters, einen Streich gespielt." Dörpfeld (*loc. cit.*, p. 16) thinks that the sanctuary *ἐν Λίμναις* was then no longer in existence.